REMARKS

Applicant's representative expresses appreciation for the in-person interview conducted on November 18, 2009. The amendments and following remarks are consistent with what was discussed during the interview.

The Office Action mailed October 2, 2009, considered and rejected claims 1-19, 21 and 22. Claims 1, 5-7, 13-17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bates et al.* (U.S. Publ. No. 2003/0221185) in view of *Bates et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,251,808) hereinafter *Bates_2*. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bates et al.* in view of *Bates_2* and *Kobayashi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,888). Claims 2-4 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bates et al.* in view of *Bates_2*, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of *Dandoy* (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0230954). [1]

By this response, claims 1, 5-9, 13-14, 17, 18, and 21 are amended, while claim 15 is canceled. Claims 1-14, 16-19, and 21 remain pending of which claims 1 and 17 are independent.

The present invention is directed to embodiments for using attributes to annotate source code in a manner that specifies how debugging information for the annotated source code is to be displayed during debugging. The claim amendments have been made to better clarify what attributes are as well as what they contain. For example, the independent claims recite that an attribute annotates a type, field, method, or property. Each attribute contains either a field, property, or method that is evaluated to determine what is displayed for the corresponding annotated type, field, method, or property. An example of this kind of attribute is shown on line 19 of page 8 of the specification.

The cited art fails to teach or suggest each aspect of the claims. For example, neither of the Bates references discloses the use of attributes. The closest thing disclosed is the display of comments that are proximate to the line of code that defines a variable as is shown in figure 7 of Bates-1. This figure shows that when the variable "stuff.y" is hovered over, its associated comment "stuff is important to output" is displayed. *See* ¶ 67. However, comments as used in Bates-1 are simply text that is meaningless when compiled and do not affect the source code in

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

any way. In contrast, the present invention involves the use of attributes which are accessed and evaluated with the source code. In this manner, the field, property, or method inside the attributes can be evaluated and affect what is displayed for a corresponding type, field, method, or property. In short, the Bates references fail to teach or suggest: "a debuggee that includes one or more attributes associated with the computer software application, which attributes are employed by the debugger to facilitate debugging of the software application, wherein the attributes annotate one or more of a type, field, method, or property of the software application, and wherein each of the one or more attributes contains a field, property, or method that is evaluated during debugging to customize the display of the corresponding annotated type, field, method, or property; and, an expression evaluator that evaluates the field, property, or method of each of the one or more attributes, and presents debug information representing the corresponding type, field, method, or property based on the evaluation of the field, property, or method within the associated attribute," as claimed in combination with the other limitations of independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 23rd day of November, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian D. Tucker/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT:cj
2588868_1